

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/507,083	09/08/2004	Robert Kline	555255-012409	8902	
24325 PATENT GRO	7590 04/30/200 OLIP 2N	9	EXAMINER		
JONES DAY			NOONAN, WILLOW W		
NORTH POIN 901 LAKESIE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELAND			2446		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/30/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/507,083	KLINE ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Willow Noonan	2446		

	Willow Noonan	2446					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 05 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (f) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.131; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing     The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I	).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>			cause				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	w);						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re-	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reject	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ided below of appended.						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons wity it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 13(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
See Continuation Sheet.							
<ul> <li>12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. Other:</li> </ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
/Jeffrey Pwu/	/Willow Noonan/						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446	Examiner, Art Unit 2446						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Logue does not teach transmitting a "successful prediction motification to the state prediction motification indicating that the user has made the stored data request during the time period." However, Logue does teaches that it is well known to communicate cache hits from the caching device to a hit accumulator for the purpose of updating statistical information. See Logue at col. 5, lines 11-29 ("Client request that are serviced from the proxy server's local document cache 465 are communicated to the hit accumulator server 415. As will be described below, the hit accumulator server 415 maintains and organizes the data so as to provide hit tracking information to remote daministrators such as remote site administrator 490."). Logue's logging and transmitting of cache hits is equivalent to a successful prediction notification—a cache hit prepresents a successful prediction.

Applicant further argues that Examiner has improperly combines the Logue reference. Applicant asserts that Examiner has provided no reasoning as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would look to Logue and combine it with three other reference. However, Examiner stated in the Final Office Action: It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use Logue's care hit notifications in modified Kasriel because Logue teaches that the disclosed technique providers more accurate tracking of total kis. Seel, at A. 2, paragraph 2 (Thereby allowing remote site administrators to accurately track total hits (i.e., those requests serviced from a proxy's local cache and the requests serviced by the remote server!)

Applicant finally argues that the successful prediction notification in the present application serves a different function than the hit tracking in Loque (i.e., updating the prediction module). However, this limitation does not appear in the claims.